



Volume 27 | Issue 2

Article 19

January 1921

Equity--Procedure--Depositions I Equity May Be Taken After Cause Has Matured and in Advance of Answers

A. W. L.

West Virginia University College of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr>



Part of the [Civil Procedure Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

A. W. L., *Equity--Procedure--Depositions I Equity May Be Taken After Cause Has Matured and in Advance of Answers*, 27 W. Va. L. Rev. (1921).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol27/iss2/19>

This Recent Case is brought to you for free and open access by the WVU College of Law at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Law Review by an authorized editor of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

damages largely does away with the main objection to the principal case, *viz.*, the plaintiff's difficulty of obtaining adequate relief.

—M. T. V.

EQUITY—PROCEDURE—DEPOSITIONS IN EQUITY MAY BE TAKEN AFTER CAUSE HAS MATURED AND IN ADVANCE OF ANSWER.—In a suit to set aside an alleged sale of some coal properties, an exception was taken to the reading of certain depositions taken on behalf of the plaintiff before the filing of the answers. The ground of such exception was that the depositions were prematurely taken. *Held*, that there is no merit in this objection. *Tierney v. United Pocahontas Co. et al.*, 102 S. E. 249 (W. Va. 1920).

Under some statutes and in chancery under special circumstances, depositions may be taken *de bene esse* after service of process; and before an answer has been filed; and in special cases before the return of the writ or the appearance of the defendant. *Harding v. American Glucose Co.*, 182 Ill. 551, 55 N. E. 577; *Amory v. Fellowes*, 5 Mass. 219; *Mumford v. Church*, 1 Johns. Cas. 147 (N. Y.); *Southwell v. Limerick*, 9 Mod. 133, 88 Eng. Reprint 360; *Gilpin v. Semple*, 1 Dall. 251 (Pa.). Under the chancery practice as to depositions in chief, and under some statutes, the cause must be at issue before depositions can be taken. This is the strict common-law rule. *Karaway v. Kentucky Ref. Co.*, 163 Fed. 189; *Henderson v. Hall*, 134 Ala. 455, 32 So. 840; *S. C. Hall Lumber Co. v. Gustin*, 54 Mich. 624, 20 N. W. 616; *Gardner v. Roycrofters*, 103 N. Y. Supp. 637; *Barnsley v. Powell*, 3 Atk. 593, 66 Eng. Reprint 1142. In West Virginia there is a rule which prohibits the taking of a deposition to prove a matter before it is pleaded. *Egdell v. Smith*, 50 W. Va. 426, 40 S. E. 402; *Goldsmith v. Goldsmith*, 46 W. Va. 426, 33 S. E. 266. But the West Virginia courts seem to look at the pleading rather than the issue, and say that there is no practice forbidding the plaintiff to support the allegations of his complaint, by proof, even before they are denied. *James v. Piggot*, 70 W. Va. 435, 74 S. E. 667.

—A. W. L.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE—CONTROL BY STATES—REGULATION OF INTERSTATE TRANSMISSION OF NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY.—An electric plant generated electricity in Virginia and transmitted the electric current directly to consumers in West Virginia. The West